

ISSUES 0

FUTURE POLITICS, BUSINESS, LEADERSHIP, AND JOY
PUBLISHED BY HOUSE OF FUTURES, JANUARY 2010

: UNWRAPPING TOMORROW



: LIVING THE FUTURE NOW : POPCORN ON PURPOSE
: GNP IS NOT HAPPINESS : ISSUE BOUND
: CATCHING UP! : OPEN LETTER



ISSUES 0

ISSUES IS PUBLISHED BY HOUSE OF FUTURES (HOF),
NYBROGADE 26A, 1.-2., DK - 1203 COPENHAGEN K.
WEB: WWW.HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
E-MAIL: HOF@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
TELEPHONE: +45 2021 1147

EDITOR IN CHIEF:
GITTE LARSEN, EDITIONS (DK)

POLITICS EDITORS:
SØREN STEEN OLSEN & STEEN SVENDSEN, PUBLIC FUTURES (DK)

BUSINESS EDITOR:
FLEMMING WISLER, NXT (DK)

LEADERSHIP EDITOR:
THOMAS GEUKEN, PSYCCES (DK)

JOY EDITOR:
SASCHA AMARASINHA, RESPOND (DK)

ART DIRECTOR:
MARTIN JOHANSSON NGOLO, INCK. (SE) AND GITTE LARSEN,
EDITIONS (DK)

LAYOUT:
GITTE LARSEN, EDITIONS (DK)

PHOTOS: MARTIN JOHANSSON NGOLO, INCK. (SE), ULRIK
JANTZEN, DAS BURO (DK)

COVER:
MARTIN JOHANSSON NGOLO (SE), AND STINE SKØTT
OLESEN, NXT (DK)

MODEL:
GISELE NGOLO (CONGO/SE)

ENGLISH ADAPTION:
ALLAN JENKINS (US/DK), DESIRABLEROASTEDCOFFEE.COM

ONLINE ONLY

JANUARY 2010

ISSUES 0 : UNWRAPPING TOMORROW

WELCOME TO THE FIRST ISSUE
OF ISSUES. A LIFESTYLE MAGAZINE
ABOUT FUTURE BUSINESS, POLITICS,
LEADERSHIP, AND JOY.

**: MOVING FROM ME BEHAVIOUR
TO WE BEHAVIOUR**

HOUSE OF FUTURES



CONTENTS

1. **Intro:** Living the future now
2. **Why House of Futures? “Popcorn”** from the members on 2 issues: What is the highest purpose of the company of the future, and why are you a founding member?
3. **Article:** BNP is not happiness
4. **Comment:** What "issue bound" work means
5. **Catching Up!** Short stories on politics, business and leadership.
6. **Who we are**
7. **Where we live**
8. **Outtro:** Open letter



ISSUE: AN ISSUE IS A POINT, A MATTERS, A CASE, OR A DISPUTE, BUT IT'S NOT ONLY THAT. IT'S ALSO AN ACT OF SENDING OUT, PUTTING FORTH, OR DISTRIBUTING, AND THE WORD CAN EVEN BE USED TO DESCRIBE THE NEXT STEP OF PUTTING SOMETHING FORTH: NAMELY THE POINT A POINT AT WHICH A MATTER IS READY FOR DECISION: TO BRING A CASE TO AN ISSUE.

OTHER DESCRIPTIONS OF "ISSUE":

- SOMETHING PROCEEDING FROM ANY SOURCE, AS A PRODUCT, EFFECT, RESULT, OR CONSEQUENCE: HIS WORDS WERE THE ISSUE OF AN INTELLIGENT MAN.
- THE ULTIMATE RESULT, EVENT, OR OUTCOME OF A PROCEEDING, AFFAIR, ETC.: THE ISSUE OF A CONTEST.
- OFFSPRING; PROGENY: TO DIE WITHOUT ISSUE.
- A GOING, COMING, PASSING, OR FLOWING OUT: FREE ISSUE AND ENTRY.
- TO MINT, PRINT, OR PUBLISH FOR SALE OR DISTRIBUTION: TO ISSUE A NEW COIN; TO ISSUE A NEW BOOK.
- BEING AT OPPOSITE VIEWPOINTS; IN DISAGREEMENT: MEDICAL EXPERTS ARE STILL AT ISSUE OVER THE PROPER USE OF TRANQUILIZERS.

SYNONYMS FOR "ISSUE": COPY, EDITION, PRINTING, PROBLEM, QUESTION, UPSHOT, CONCLUSION, END, FLOW, EMANATE, ARISE, SPRING, ENSUE.

SOURCE: WWW.DICTIONARY.COM

LIVING THE FUTURE NOW

Unwrapping tomorrow is about living the future now. What does it take? It requires asking new questions, and waiting a little bit longer for the answers. It takes the courage to think and act in new ways ... the ability to include other perspectives and dimensions needed to make your choices flourish ... listening to your heart, which might be the hardest thing, given our one-dimensional way of thinking, leading and doing politics and business. That's why ISSUES is also about joy.

Living the future now is about your ability to create and manifest your visions for the future – whether it is your future or that of your team, your organization or your products. GNP is, in fact, not happiness. Read all about it in the article.

Most change and development is hard in the beginning. Eventually, it becomes easier just to be hard again. When that happens, you might be on the right track. Keep to it. See what is. Embrace what happens. Trust chaos as much as you trust knowing.

"What is the House of Futures?," we are asked by the people we meet and to whom we tell our stories. Here is our answer: we create new opportunities in politics, business and leadership. Because of our different approaches and perspectives, we embrace the present and shape the future. House of Futures (HOF)

is a social knowledge company – and, for us, it is all about being in good company. We are a group of people and companies working to create knowledge, vision and new paths for the benefit of others. We have created HOF without planning it. We have come together without knowing each other. We will work together, going forward without knowing the goal. Do you want to go along? Together we can create a movement, the company and organization of the future.

And, yes: We are looking forward to having clients. We have one subscriber to this magazine, and you know who you are! And, yes: we will come up with what our products will be. Yes, we do not yet know exactly what HOF will be. To be honest, I am not sure we ever want to finish this process of not knowing what, when, and how. At least, not as long as I know why and am enjoying the journey. Read about the why part in the article, where the members of HOF answer two questions: 1) What is the highest purpose of the company of the future? and 2) Why are you a founding member of HOF?

One thing we do – and will do well – is our magazine, ISSUES. We have a few rules of engagement at HOF, one being that our work will be "issue bound." The issue, whatever it is, will always be at the center, and


we will address it, with love and respect, from each of our own personal and professional angles. Read more about what "issue bound" work means in the comment.

Some people say "wait and see." At HOF, we say "see and wait." Watch us – we'll be worth waiting for! Start here and get a sneak peek into who we are, what we think are the most interesting and important issues right now, and what our common visions for living the future now are. We hope you'll enjoy ISSUES 0. The next edition of ISSUES will be out – also in print! – in April, 2010.

Editor-in-Chief,
CEO House of Futures



Gitte Larsen



“HOW DO WE STAY
CHINESE IN THE FUTURE?”
A CHINESE BUSINESS MAN
ASKED FUTURIST ALVIN TOFFLER.
TOFLER ANSWERED:
“NOBODY STAYS ANYTHING IN THE
FUTURE. YOUR QUESTION
SHOULD BE: HOW CAN WE
BECOME CHINESE OF THE FUTURE?”

“POPCORN” ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THE COMPANY OF THE FUTURE.
TWO QUESTIONS. 20 ANSWERS. WHAT DO YOU THINK?

FUTURIST: THE TERM ‘FUTURISTS’ MOST COMMONLY DESCRIBES AUTHORS, CONSULTANTS, ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS AND OTHERS WHO ENGAGE IN INTERDISCIPLINARY AND SYSTEMS THINKING TO ADVISE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS. FUTURISTS COME FROM A WIDE RANGE OF BACKGROUNDS AND WALKS OF LIFE, BE IT LIBERAL ARTS, PSYCHOLOGY, ENGINEERING, THE SCIENCES. A GROWING NUMBER ARE COMING FROM THE DOZEN OR SO FUTURES DEGREE PROGRAMS WORLD-WIDE. WHAT THEY HAVE IN COMMON IS BIG PICTURE THINKING, STRONG PATTERN RECOGNITION, AND INNATE CURIOSITY. OTHER CHARACTERISTICS TYPICAL OF FUTURISTS INCLUDE OPENNESS TO NEW EXPERIENCES, COMFORT WITH AMBIGUITY, THINKING SYSTEMATICALLY, SEEING OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVES, QUESTIONING AND CHALLENGING ASSUMPTIONS, A GLOBAL OUTLOOK, A LONG-TERM TIME HORIZON, OPTIMISTIC, AND HAVING A SENSE OF PURPOSE.

SOURCE: WIKIPEDIA & ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL FUTURISTS.

ALVIN TOFFLER: AMERICAN FUTURIST AND AUTHOR OF BOOKS LIKE FUTURE SHOCK (1970), WHICH IS STILL HIGHLY RECOMMENDABLE WHEN THE ISSUE IS THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE SPEED OF CHANGE, AND HE’S LATEST BOOK, WHICH IS AMONG OTHERS CO-WRITTEN WITH HIS WIFE HEIDI TOFFLER, IS REVOLUTIONARY WEALTH (2007).

SASCHA AMARASINHA, communication and leadership consultant, Respond.

THOMAS GEUKEN, industrial psychologist and partner in Psycces.

Q1. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST PURPOSE OF THE COMPANY OF THE FUTURE?

SASCHA AMARASINHA: To create lasting results, results that are different from and more than just money. Companies must be able to see themselves in the larger context and make informed decisions that are sustainable seven generations into the future. Therefore, we must ensure that conversations flow freely, that everything can be questioned and that the company is responsive - even to inputs that are not obviously in its sphere of interest.

THOMAS GEUKEN: The highest purpose of the company in the future is to have a purpose. The company must be significant for its contemporaries and the future that it is helping to create through its efforts. The company of the future is sort of a village hall where we produce the things

FLEMMING WISLER, director, NXT.

STEEN SVENDSEN, futurist and partner in the knowledge firm Public Futures.

DORTHE STEENBERG, Shaman and director of Power Spirit.

FARZIN FARAHMAND, industrial psychologist and partner in Psycces.

GITTE LARSEN, futurist scientist and author, owner of Editions. Chief editor of ISSUES and director of House of Futures.

TINA MONBERG, lawyer, mediator and psychotherapist. Founder and partner of Mediationcenter A/S

we need. FLEMMING WISLER: It's finding the balance between the many different bottom lines - above all, taking it seriously that there is more than one bottom line. A company must be able to withstand history's verdict: here, a company is not especially rewarded for creating great financial performance, but for creating enduring values, such as social conscience, and making a product that makes a difference. It is only when such a company disappears that we see it made a difference. What did it give us? If no one has an answer, it was irrelevant.

STEEN SVENDSEN: The highest purpose of the political company of the future is to be representative and have vision and leadership. That it has ambitions to give the community a vital role in societal development. It is important because we are in the middle of our time, and through political activity we can shape the future together - and give a shove to history.

DORTHE STEENBERG: It is to serve the world. Giving to the world should be just as important as taking from it, thus keeping a balance. Because we must remember we are here for the world; it is not just here for us. We live through each other. The balance already exists in nature - somewhere in the history of mankind -- but we have forgotten it. The principle is called AYNi and describes how everything in the universe is mutually created and built.

FARZIN FAHRMAN: It is that people are our most important and precious resource. When a company says this, and many do, they must mean it and treat people as an asset. The resource that people are must be accounted for in several ways, so that it is not always money or physical assets that set the scene. If you believe people are the most important, then you need to answer how you use, process, service and maintain them. It is not just about economic growth. Perhaps it is time to think of stability – in other words, that the company has something stable going, not that its making billion. More and more it is about existing and developing quality. On the one hand, it is economic stability, and on the other hand it is about stability of existence.

GITTE LARSEN: The company's highest goal is to be a part of the world for better or worse. This means the company must be conscious of what it wants to contribute and create, and what the consequences of its actions are. A company is a living organization, and more should recognize that employees contribute as much as, and often more than, shareholders. Employees contribute with brain, heart and soul, not just money. They contribute their dedication, energy and time. With life. The company of the future must help create new destinations, new opportunities - for itself as a company, for the people who are the company, and for the world.

TINA MONBERG: To be able to see the whole view and navigate in accordance with this picture. A company with a whole view knows its needs and that of its surroundings - and considers both before mak-

SØREN ULRIK FANGHOLM, Strategic Management.

SØREN STEEN OLSEN, futurist and partner in the knowledge firm Public Futures; board chairman, House of Futures.

ing a decision. Being able to do this requires three roles in the company. First, the company is led by a servant leader who only becomes a leader because he or she has a holistic vision. Second, employees are able to take personal leadership for living this vision. The company has people who can mediate any conflict between the servant leadership and the personal leadership, and facilitate the vision.

SØREN ULRIK FANGHOLM: Courage. Creativity. Curiosity. Culture. Crazyness. The company of the future has the courage to extend its creativity beyond the ordinary way of doing things. The brave believers will change what they are doing just because history shows it works. Truly curious innovators will ask, “what if what we have never tried before works better?” Then try it. The highest purpose of the company is to investigate its own curiosity and have the courage and creative strength to follow the innovative path. Employees of the future, the students of today, will be among those to deliver this courage and creativity. Some of them seek other dimensions than the traditional focus on company growth and profit; they require a workplace/space that allows growth on a personal level. We must remember to let people to be people – not roles. Future successful companies will be innovative playgrounds where people seek and develop personal inner growth from which profitable business growth will arise. A change in work culture is required; people should have the option to break with the parts of old systems, processes and control spans that limit personal inner growth.

Søren Steen Olsen: The company's highest goal is expanding human experience, knowledge, wisdom and fulfilment.

Q2. WHY ARE YOU A FOUNDING MEMBER OF HOUSE OF FUTURES?

DORTHE STEENBERG: Because it's easier for me to recognize my own power when I am with other people. When I can see the and recognize their power, it becomes clearer and more powerful for me. The force is the belief in life, confidence in the future, the joy of knowing that everything is possible. It is the dream that exists in human hearts, where we know that everything is one, that everything is possible. When I see the light in the eyes of others, I dare to believe in my own. The whole is greater than me, and this is great. Oneness is not just something clever, it actually exists.

GITTE LARSEN: Because I want so much to create something valuable with idealistic, curious, ambitious and courageous people. Because I want to work and live with people I respect and care about. And because I want to shove the assumptions we all have about the future, unconsciously and consciously, to create new and better places to go. I know that I cannot do that alone

THOMAS GEUKEN: HOF is interesting and fascinating for me to be because it could well be the place where the questions many companies and managers ask today can be qualified into future solutions. We need some people who stand together and who are willing to go beyond convention. We need people who dare say the obvious, but that others dare not say. I am here to help lift what is possible. To be involved in the changes taking place and dare to influence them and give them direction. And not only the commercially lucrative. I am also here to “mix” with others. I am also here because these are people I care about.

FARZIN FAHRMAN: I am part of HOF because the ideals we have discussed fit my ideals about how we should work and what we want to create in the world. I also believe it reflects the company of the future. To show we can create a business in a different way. I believe this group is a strong one. When we stand together, we can make a difference in society – at least, we certainly have a better chance to.

SØREN ULRIK FANGHOLM: Because I thrive on HOF’s burst and flow of energy. Because I know we will make a relevant difference in business and society. We dare to take first steps where others turned and walked back. Because the HOF team has the courage to do things today that will determine how we do things tomorrow. And because we are a strong team with the necessary creative courage and curiosity to say: We’ll do it – and jump in. Because HOF understands culture in its broadest sense, from business culture to sub-cultural trends. And because we all are a little bit crazy, which gives us the strength to swim against the stream of traditional ways of doing things. HOF is a powerhouse with skills to form the future.

SASCHA AMARASINHA: I am in HOF because I need to melt my dream, or my vision, of a different way of doing business with the dreams of others. This makes it easier for both me and those who are looking for other ways to see how we can go to the edge. In HOF, we have different experiences and skills, along with a basic trust and respect that everyone has something unique to contribute.

TINA MONBERG: Because in HOF, I know I will be able to live the highest purpose of a company.

FLEMMING WISLER: I am a part of HOF because it is a partnership between a group of people who will make a difference. Who, above all, are wise and experienced enough to know what is right and wrong, what works and what does not in an age when experience means more than ever. How love for the future, with its infinite possibilities, is a common driver.

STEEN SVENDSEN: Because I believe that we, through the people of HOF, will be better able to match the many possible approaches to the future – for the benefit of others.

Q2. WHY ARE YOU A FOUNDING MEMBER OF HOUSE OF FUTURES?





GNP IS NOT HAPPINESS. SOCIETY NEEDS NEW GOALS.

BY SØREN STEEN OLSEN, PARTNER IN
PUBLIC FUTURES, CHAIRMAN OF THE
BOARD, HOF.

GNP IS THE WORLD'S MEASUREMENT OF DE- VELOPMENT, BUT HOW GOOD IS IT, REALLY?

The French commission, headed by economists Joseph Stiglitz and Amartya Sen, sharply criticized GNP as a measure of community condition. The criticism can be summarized in three points:

- #1 GNP imperfectly reflects society's total output
- #2 Total output is a flawed expression of a society's present status
- #3 A society's present status is an inadequate reflection of its future

Source : Stiglitz, Joseph m.fl., september 2009: Report by the Commission on the *Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. Kan downloades på <http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr>

Without having analyzed it, I am confident that debates about the definitions of national account concepts rarely draw big headlines. But now it is heating up! At least, compared to the usual level of drama in the statistics world. At the center of an intense debate is GNP itself – gross national product. In 2004, the OECD launched the Global Project on Measuring the Progress in Societies. It has assembled statisticians at serious international conferences and has published such papers as *Measuring the Progress of Societies. An Introduction and Practical Guide*. Now the debate has received a boost from a high-profile initiative by French president Nicolas Sarkozy. In February 2008, he set up a commission, which included five Nobel Prize-winning economists led by Joseph Stiglitz and Amartya Sen, that presented recommendations for reforming the statistical system in September 2009.

The debate is important. GNP is often used as a measure of social development, and what we measure determines what we do. How we set success criteria and performance determines how we evaluate various policy options and how we design and develop new initiatives - whether in politics or in business. The debate on GNP is also an indication that society, not just statistics, has fundamentally changed. Our statistical standards were established and developed in the 1940s and 1950s. They have been adjusted often, but are conceptually unchanged. And, ever since, being able to say “GNP” with a straight face has been one of the criteria for being taken seriously in political debate. But the concept has always had problems and limi-

tations, and now there is a growing impression of a widening gap between reality and the picture painted by the statistic.

The Stiglitz Report points to studies that are highly skeptical about the official statistics in many western countries. Indeed, the commission is highly critical of GNP as a measure of societal conditions. These criticisms are summarized thus:

- # 1 GNP imperfectly reflects society's total output
- # 2 Total output is a flawed expression of a society's present status
- # 3 A society's present status is an inadequate reflection of its future

1 GNP IMPERFECTLY REFLECTS SOCIETY'S TOTAL OUTPUT

The first point is purely technical. Measuring such a large, complex thing as total output is fraught with problems. These problems are widely recognized by economists, but are glossed over with the assumption that GNP is better than other measures.

Conceptually, GNP is based on the market and market prices: the assumption is that anything sold has a value for the buyer (that is, the price he is willing to pay). But not everything is sold in a market: for example, the public sector, which accounts for a third to a half of the GNP in industrialized countries. In GNP calculations, public sector GNP is reckoned from its costs. If public services can be provided more cheaply, GNP falls. Moreover, much informal production, where money is not exchanged, is not taken into account: childcare, cleaning, cooking, gardening, repairs, etc. But when these services are bought and paid for, they increase GNP.

It is remarkably difficult to capture dynamism and account for qualitative changes in production, whether it is public or private. The assortment of goods and services the economy produces and consumes is entirely different from that of five, 50 or 100 years ago. Moreover, as the assortment changes, it is basically impossible to express the development in a single figure. It is like comparing apples and oranges.

2 TOTAL OUTPUT IS A FLAWED EXPRESSION OF A SOCIETY'S PRESENT STATUS

The second point is more qualitative and far more fundamental: is what we measure relevant? Are production and income - even if we could calculate them satisfactorily -- good proxies for the state of society, personal satisfaction and quality of life? The answer is a resounding no. Total income is a factor, but there are many others. One of the most obvious omissions is leisure time. For example, the US has a higher GNP per capita than Europe, but Americans work far more hours per year, have longer work-weeks and fewer holidays. This should be considered when viewing the total picture.

Another omission is income distribution. Average GNP can grow when some

people are making far more money while others are not. In the US, medium income has barely changed in 20 years, while GNP has increased smartly. Incomes have risen in the upper levels, and the further up the scale, the greater the increase. Similarly GNP omits such relevant factors as health, life expectancy, stress and many others.

Therefore, the Stiglitz Commission points us to research into happiness: research that tries to quantify how happy people are. It approaches happiness from both objective, measurable angles (for example, brain activity and the presence of stress indicators in the blood) and subjective, qualitative angles (for example, simply asking people how they feel). And quite subjectively, it is thought to be more appropriate to develop policy from a goal of making people content rather than increasing GNP as much as possible.

3 A SOCIETY'S PRESENT STATUS IS AN INADEQUATE REFLECTION OF ITS FUTURE

Finally, there is the future. GNP may indicate production and income in a given year, but says nothing about the future. If society does not invest in machinery, buildings, land, infrastructure, education, etc., future production will fall. If society depletes natural resources - forests, fish, raw materials - this depletion should be reckoned against income. This also applies to the environment: clean water, clean air, recreational nature areas, landscapes, etc. GNP, therefore, does not include sustainability. In fact, even in a narrow economic sense, GNP does not address sustainability: wealth and debt, assets and liabilities are not even reckoned. This prompted some commission members to suggest that one-sided focus on GNP may have helped amplify the huge economic bubble that burst into a global financial crisis.

Despite the massive criticisms of GNP, the French commission loses its way with its fairly modest proposals. For example, it believes that an overall measure cannot be developed to replace GNP. Instead, it aims to develop a comprehensive, standardized system of indicators for societal development, in which (an improved) GNP is one of several, and is complemented by other, equally relevant indicators.

Few would put their lives on the line for a new statistical system. And, alone, a new system cannot lead society forward. But looking at GNP from a more relative approach may be a useful step toward our better understanding of what anything is worth and what is worth anything.



WHAT "ISSUE BOUND" WORK MEANS.

COMMENT BY STEEN SVENDSEN, PUBLUC FUTURES
AND WORKING MEMBER HOF.

Most knowledge workers will probably agree that we should start with the specific problem to be solved. But few actually do, and few are aware they do not.

Consultants, managers, researchers, bureaucrats and others - in short, knowledge workers - often have an advanced education followed by a professional life in which their education is constantly refined and specialized. Education and working life gives each knowledge worker a certain self-understanding and role in relation to others.

Some have probably met consultants who, when analyzing a problem, have oddly enough determined the problem can be solved only with their particular expertise. The practice is certainly not limited to consulting and other situations where a fee is at stake. Physicians meet patients with a medical approach that emphasizes diagnosis. Bureaucrats meet the patients from a social services approach with an emphasis on rights, regulations and precedent. The approach of the practitioner of "alternative medicine" is rooted in astrology, Eastern traditions or some other approach.

What knowledge workers have in common is that they are shaped by their specialization, and thus by the way they understand themselves and organizations, and how the outside world understands them. All must refer back to a third party. The consequence for the patient is that he encounters a series of professions that each must refer to something else: the physician to the scientific tradition, the official to public administration, and the alternative practitioner to his root direction or conviction. Each is bound by his background and discipline. And each approaches the patient from his or her own angle

Results are that spontaneity, direct understanding and the human relationship are replaced with distance and professionalism. "Where you sit is where you stand," says a classic analysis of political representation of interests and actors. It is still true, and in more and more areas.

As more and more knowledge workers with advanced educations compete with each other about the right approach to the patient, citizen, future or business, we must think differently. We must base ourselves on the individual, the specific problem and the question at hand. We need to be issue bound. It sounds simple, but it is not.

LOOK THE ISSUE IN THE EYE

To be issue bound requires you to be aware of your approach and self-understanding. You must be aware of your prejudices and limitations – of your own should be aware of its prejudices and limitations – of one's own distance. It requires you to let the issue come first: to let the individual, organization and businesses have their say on their own merits - and not within a prespecified and defined framework of any kind. For example, a person's selfevaluation of their own health is the best indicator of how well they are. To work in an issue bound way is also requires the willingness to seek the path that best fits the individual, not the consultant or adviser. This requires an interdisciplinary approach and knowledge of other areas – this is as important as knowing one's own area.

For many years, we have been equipped by education and training to address various issues. We stand today as the proud and well-paid vanguard of the knowledge society. But the price has been distance and the loss of instinct. I think it is time to step back, dare to look the issue in the eye, and let solutions spring from need, not our profession or tradition. Though this could just be the view of a generalist with many tools in the box.

CATCHING UP!

WHAT WE THINK ARE INTEREST- ING ISSUES RIGHT NOW.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

JUST DO IT!

A new hot topic is the “volunteer sector as a laboratory for new social solutions.” Just before Denmark’s recent municipal elections, the Aarhus-Copenhagen mayoral double team, Frank Jensen and Nicolaj Wammen, wrote an op-ed advocating social democratic thinking in this direction. Volunteers should be pioneers for innovative grassroots solutions and initiatives that can complement and inspire the public sector. They named Barack Obama as inspiration, not least because of his social innovation initiatives.

But perhaps there is at least as much inspiration to be drawn from the United Kingdom – from the Conservative Party, no less. Conservative leader David Cameron has an ambitious plan for a National Citizen Service that will include all 16-year-olds. Unusually, he is not waiting to take office to put his plan in motion (there is an election this year). He has already started a pilot project, the first wave of which is already implemented, funded by contributions from the private sector – but without making a PR stunt out of it. The focus is on making the project work, then scaling it up.

The project is called The Challenge. It is a three-week course for 16-year-olds in leadership, teamwork and social entrepreneurship. This program is designed to especially appeal to the 16-year-old and his/her personal development ("Your chance to prove yourself!"). The program includes climbing, rappelling and canoeing – with a good citizenship element discreetly entering through the back door. If Cameron becomes prime minister, his intention is to roll out the program nationwide. It is an unusual and innovative form of policy development -- and not particularly conservative. Perhaps it is an idea for Jensen, Wammen and the Danish social democrats. No need to wait for political power: just do it!

QUOTES:

“WE ARE THE MUSIC MAKERS,
AND WE ARE THE DREAMERS OF DREAMS,
WANDERING BY LONE SEA-BREAKERS,
AND SITTING BY DESOLATE STREAMS;—
WORLD-LOSERS AND WORLD-FORSAKERS,
ON WHOM THE PALE MOON GLEAMS:
YET WE ARE THE MOVERS AND SHAKERS
OF THE WORLD FOR EVER, IT SEEMS.”
ARTHUR O’SHAUGHNESSY, BRITISH POET, 1844-1881

“IF YOU DO NOT MAKE A STRATEGY OF YOUR OWN,
YOU BECOME PART OF SOMEONE ELSE’S STRATEGY.”
ALVIN TOFFLER, FUTURIST, 1928-

ANCIENT WISDOM
AND SPIRITUALITY

LOSE YOUR MIND!



MAYAN TEMPLE AND ITS NINE LEVELS OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

”This temple is a living monument to our time on Earth and our human growth. This temple represents our evolution from 16.4 billion years until its imminent completion in 2011/2012. Each step is a stage of evolution, each step is very steep, and each step becomes increasingly shorter. We are currently on our eighth step known as the Galactic Era. This era, which began in 1999 and will complete its super quick cycle in February 2011, is about behaving ethically! Guess what? Greed, corruption, control, manipulation, slavery and all forms of left-brain dominant thinking modalities leading to unethical behavior has reached its zenith. If you have not learned to behave ethically, you will be joining the dinosaurs, the Cro-Magnons (cave dwellers) and the other extinct life forms that were composted. At which time, the rest of humanity will enter the ninth and final stage of human evolution: the Universal Era- a time when we remember how to consciously evolve and co-create our realities; a time when we remember we are truly the Gods and the Goddesses.”

Source: Celestial Speed-up.

THE ART OF BECOMING WISER

According to Berlingske Tidende, it has become fashionable for senior executives around the world to apologize for both large and small mistakes. When a potential scandal knocks on the door, it is important to quickly offer an apologetic gesture and say "sorry, it was not intentional, it won't happen again." Fine, and far better than "no comment." But when everyone has learned this, there is the next phase. To learn from your mistakes. Also called the art of becoming wiser. Who wants to be first?

WILL YOU WAIT FOR INVESTORS TO ASK?

Quote by Eric Borremans, Head of Sustainable and Responsible Investments, BNP Paribas (world's 5th largest bank): "As investors, we must review our existing investments systematically to identify those companies that are winners and losers in the long term in relation to climate change." He stresses that it is not nearly enough that investors view climate change as something that only concerns investment in "green" companies. Source: Børsen, 13 November 2009.

PREDICTABLY IRRATIONAL

Dan Ariely, Professor at Duke University, wrote the book "Predictably Irrational" last year. Watch the 3 videos on YouTube

About The Power of Price

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nm5GB7Wu26Q&feature=channel>

About FREE!

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LmJzQ3cVt88&feature=channel>

About the author Dan Ariely

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VZv--sm9XXU>

WHEN GENDER IS AN ISSUE

Danske Bank recently appeared in the Danish daily *Berlingske Tidende* because of a politically-correct appointment of a woman to the bank's executive committee. In the article, Første kvinde i toppen af Danske (First woman at the top of Danske Bank), CEO Peter Straarup states the bank has not sought specific feminine values. Eva Hald, who is now one of two women on the committee, is quoted in the article as saying she was not hired because she is a woman. In other words, gender is one aspect the bank would like to brand itself with, but gender is not an issue -- at least not one Danske Bank (and, undoubtedly, the more than 100 other Danish companies who have signed the voluntary Charter for More Women in Business) can manage to work with constructively.

Food for thought: 1. Was Peter Straarup hired because he is a man? 2. Does the bank and the financial world need such feminine skills as caring, relationship maintenance, and the ability to build "community"? 3. Isn't it time that the gender debate, when it comes to corporate management, be about missing competences rather than gender?

We need to move the gender debate from being about the statistical equality between men and women to the equality of the value of masculine and feminine skills. Equality can be measured and weighed. Equality of value can be lived and felt. It is no longer about the gender wars, but about what men and women can create together. All studies show that mixed-gender managements perform best in every measure, including financials. This is because when there are more than one or two representatives of either gender, we cannot put each other into stereotypical boxes, but instead concentrate on what is important, the development of our businesses and industry. Men and women both need to use their feminine skills, so everything is not so one-dimensional. Then we each can contribute with everything we have. Danish Bank could have said: "yes, we have employed a woman, and, yes, we have gone after the "soft skills" to create more balance and synergy between the masculine and feminine skills in our top management."

COLLABORATION
BY TINA MONBERG

COLLABORATION – IS IT TIME TO “NEW THINK” OURSELVES?

The word collaboration gives negative connotations about those who aided the Germans during the Occupation. But we need to rethink the word, since we can only overcome our crisis by applying a new strategy – a cooperative, or collaborative approach. Mediationcenter, which I co-own, supports Mediators Beyond Borders, which, during the COP15 conference, was an accredited NGO with access to Bella Center. It is a strange world that unfolded there. Cooperation was not on the agenda – instead, countries followed the traditional form of negotiation, struggling to get the biggest piece of cake - or the right to the most CO2 emissions.

Cooperation is not the way delegates from different countries try to solve the world's biggest crisis – and the sixth greatest destroyer of species – that we now face. We do what we usually do: compete. The infrastructure within which countries operate and negotiate is determined by the UN and cannot just be changed. A cooperative process can be difficult to implement. It is like turning a supertanker around. According to the chairman of Mediators Beyond Borders, Dr. Kenneth Cloke, the mindset for cooperation or collaboration is “when a person has a hole in their end of the boat, you have a problem that can only be solved together.”

We know we cannot solve a problem with the same mindset or way of thinking that caused the problem in the first place. The mindset that created the crisis is a competitive mindset in which we forget to focus on the interests and needs of the whole. The pollution that developed countries, through their CO2 emissions, have particularly contributed to is striking us now like a boomerang. We are sitting at the other end of the boar. But what mindset should we use to solve our problems?

I think we can only solve it by learning to work together and see things holistically - not as separate bottom lines, but coherent bottom lines. Therefore, we need to reinvent the word collaboration. In a competitive society, there is a state of opposition, because we are competing against each other. This means that some are the enemy. In a cooperative society, we are partners; competitors do not exist. With such a mindset, collaboration will take on a completely different meaning. Namely, that what we can do together is more important than what we can do alone!

: WELCOME HOME

HOUSE OF FUTURES

HOUSE OF FUTURES.

WHO WE ARE.

HOUSE OF FUTURES
NYBROGADE 26A, 1.-2. SAL
DK – 1203 COPENHAGEN K.
T: +45 2021 1147 +45 2021 1147
M: HOF@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK

HOF EXPERTS

HOF has experts within futurism, leadership, strategy, consultancy, communication, design, policy development, storytelling, art, spirituality, ancient wisdom, mediation, psychology, coaching, and performance.

FOUNDING MEMBERS

SASCHA AMARASINHA, RESPOND
E: SASCHA@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 6162 2973 +45 6162 2973
WWW.RESPOND.DK

SØREN ULRIK FANGHOLM
E: SOERENULRIK@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2628 7070

FARZIN FARAHMAND, PSYCCES
E: FARZIN@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2810 0839 +45 2810 0839
WWW.PSYCCES.DK

THOMAS GEUKEN, PSYCCES
E: THOMAS@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2810 0838 +45 2810 0838
WWW.PSYCCES.DK

GITTE LARSEN, CEO
E: GITTE@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2021 1147
WWW.EDITIONS.DK

TINA MONBERG, MEDIATIONCENTER
E: TINA@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2047 8228 +45 2047 8228
WWW.MEDIATIONCENTER.DK

SØREN STEEN OLSEN,
PUBLIC FUTURES, CHAIRMAN
E: STO@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2844 8977 +45 2844 8977
WWW.PUBLICFUTURES.DK

STEEN SVENDSEN, PUBLIC FUTURES
E: STEEN@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2360 2646 +45 2360 2646
WWW.PUBLICFUTURES.DK

DORTHE STEENBERG, POWERSPIRIT
E: DORTHE@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2628 4843 +45 2628 4843
WWW.POWERSPIRIT.DK

FLEMMING WISLER, NXT
E: FLEMMING@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2835 0541 +45 2835 0541
WWW.NXTBRAND.DK

WORKING MEMBERS

STINE SKØTT OLESEN, NXT
E: STINE@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 2711 0024 +45 2711 0024
WWW.NXTBRAND.DK

GRY WORRE HALLBERG,
FICTION PIMPS
GRY@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 26 24 77 34


MADELEINE KATE MCGOWAN,
FICTION PIMPS
MADELEINEKATE@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 51 22 89 47

INGA GERNER NIELSEN,
FICTION PIMPS
INGA@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +45 29 65 61 15

CO-WORKING MEMBERS

MARTIN JOHANSSON NGOLO, INKC.
E: MARTIN@HOUSEOFFUTURES.DK
M: +46 707923499

ALLAN JENKINS,
DESIRABLE ROASTED COFFEE.
E: ALLANJENKINS@GMAIL.COM
M: +1 864 946 9126
M: +45 36 98 76 16
WWW.DESIRABLEROASTEDCOFFEE.COM





BY SASCHA AMARASINHA

WHERE WE LIVE. IN AN OLD GRAIN WAREHOUSE


How can we call ourselves the “House of Futures,” yet have our offices in an old, low-ceilinged grain loft in the oldest part of Copenhagen? We have certainly asked ourselves that often enough during our creation process.

But we think nothing could be more appropriate that starting where it all begins. As the seed of something new, a seed not yet planted, fertilized, germinated and sprouted for the world to see. We begin, of course, with an idea: a vision for preparing the ground for a new way of doing business. A new way that creates sustainable results and success. Each of us has his or her view of how the new field looks. And we will take our time to see what kinds of seeds we each can sow, so that we can grow the best possible crop in the future.

Our projects will be like small plants that start as seedlings, that are watered and planted when they are ready. Some may be watered too much, some might not get enough water, but we are convinced that most will grow and be harvested. To the benefit of the future and those involved.

BURNING LOVE

If you visit the House of Futures, just go for a walk on Magstræde. If you're lucky, you will find a tourist guide who, with pride, will tell you that it was here that Hans Christian Andersen's Tin Soldier sailed in a ship of newspaper before he was swallowed up by the gutter and ended up in the canal. If you cannot remember how the story ends, here is a short version: the Tin Soldier's boat sinks in the canal and he is swallowed by a fish. The fish is caught, sold to the cook in the Tin Soldier's house, and suddenly he is back where he came from - and his beloved dancer, made of paper, is there still. And here comes the final twist from the old storyteller: the Tin Soldier is thrown into the stove, and his beloved little paper dancer follows him there in the breeze. That's burning love...



COME FORWARD!

OPEN LETTER BY GITTE LARSEN, CEO
HOUSE OF FUTURES.

DEAR CO-FOUNDING FATHERS AND
MOTHERS OF HOUSE OF FUTURES,

Things disappear. It happens all the time. Can happen anywhere. Suddenly nowhere to go?! Good stuff disappears. Bad stuff stays and the other way around. Luckily enough. How fortunate. Do you want to know what will happen? Foresight. And if I tell you, will you dare act upon it? Hopefully not. Not that I won't be dreaming and guessing aloud, but we will create the future together.

First, thanks to someone who is not in House of Futures - you, Eileen Klitvad - for your words over the sticks'n'sushi we waited so long for. But time passed quickly. You told me, that October night, that it was unbelievable I was bubbling with ideas in a time when everything else counted. Bottom line every day. When I thought a month or so would make do. Day by day? It's totally absurd. That, or it is very close to the continuing relationship that will replace the temporary. Don't worry about money. It's not going anywhere. And will there be money? Yes. Profit will still be a way to measure growth – but it may also be measured in other ways. New currencies are appearing and land is again becoming an important production factor.

As I wrote in the introduction of this first issue

of ISSUES, I believe we must leave our questions open-ended far longer than we used to in our work, leadership and business. We don't need auto-responses to challenges we have never confronted before. We have never before had to solve the problems our companies and our world face. We don't have a clue, yet we do not take the time to consider what we each need, what others need, or what we need to work together. The crises have not created themselves, and their causes can be found in the way we tackle growth. Shit happens. What (more) does it take to make us wiser? Thank you, Sascha, for asking such fantastic questions like these about what is needed or required. You see things from so many life-giving perspectives and sets new directions with your words and phrases. "Pop-corn" is also one of the ones I got from you.

We do not know how we - as leaders or guiding lights or pioneers - will come out the other side. As if there is another side. It's right here and now. We can choose it or leave it. It's really up to you, up to everybody. Thank you, Dorte, for seeing so clearly and for sharing what you experience and see - what you sense or "see with your senses" as you have called it in our book Common Ground. You tell great stories about what you see. Today, you told me about the woman in gold. You also said over the phone "it's just about doing it." I went out on my lawn with my dog in the early evening and watched the beautiful sunset in a cold autumn sky, and I replied: "Yes, that is how it is - I strike my stick into the ground, then rock it

HOT SPOTS: IN THE PREFACE OF LYNDA GRATTON'S BOOK, HOT SPOTS, SHE WRITES: "HOT SPOTS ARE PLACES AND TIMES WHERE COOPERATION FLOURISHES CREATING GREAT ENERGY, INNOVATION, PRODUCTIVITY AND EXCITEMENT. HOT SPOTS CAN BE WORKPLACES, TEAMS, DEPARTMENTS, COMPANIES, FACTORIES, CITIES, INDUSTRIES, COFFEE SHOPS, HALLWAYS, CONFERENCES – ANY PLACE OR TIME WHERE PEOPLE ARE WORKING TOGETHER IN EXCEPTIONALLY CREATIVE AND COLLABORATIVE WAYS."

THERE ARE THREE ELEMENTS THAT ARE ALWAYS IN PLACE IN A "HOT SPOT," AND THESE ARE:

- #1. A COOPERATIVE MINDSET WHICH APPLIES BOTH OUTSIDE AND INSIDE THE COMPANY. WHETHER A COMPANY HAS A CO-OPERATIVE MINDSET OR NOT LARGELY DEPENDS ON THE LEADERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD COOPERATION AND COMPETITION. MUTUALITY AND COLLEGIALLY ARE IMPORTANT VALUES IN A COOPERATIVE MINDSET.
- #2. BOUNDARY SPANNING. TO CREATE VALUE THROUGH INNOVATION, A "HOT SPOT" MUST RECOGNIZE AND BE COMPASSIONATE ABOUT LEARNING AND SHARING. THIS TAKES PEOPLE FROM DIFFERENT GROUPS AND COMMUNITIES, AND CROSSING BOUNDARIES CAN BE TOUGH BUT IS NECESSARY.
- #3. IGNITING PURPOSE. A COOPERATIVE MINDSET AND THE CAPACITY OF BOUNDARY SPANNING, CREATES A LATENT ENERGY, BUT A POINT OF IGNITION MUST EXIST TO RELEASE THAT ENERGY. AN IGNITING PURPOSE CAN BE A VISION, QUESTION, OR A TASK.

SOURCE: GITTE LARSEN, HOT SPOTS ARE ENERGY, ARTICLE IN FO/FUTUREORIENTATION #5/2008, COPENHAGEN INSTITUTE FOR FUTURES STUDIES.

loose. Then I hammer it down again, and keep on until I sense it holds better and better." We spoke of the angst of doing what we, deepest down, know is the right thing for us to do – on many levels. Separately and together.

Thanks, Thomas, because we are going to share the future. Thanks for all the lively discussions and talk about where I want to go, where you want to go, and where we want to go. All places to go. And thank you because I am also a part of your book project on Rock'n'roll leadership. It will be fucking great!

What happened to doing it for the fun of it? That's you again, Sascha. It was also you who said we should take the phrase, "wait and see" and turn it around to "See and wait". That's what we will do! And give me more of your kind of storytelling! And thank you, Tina, because you tirelessly (as you are, and it's great to be with you) work for and talk about and promote an alternative system that is based on sustained relationships. It is all too thought provoking that in this day and age, we have the infrastructure to send 20,000 soldiers to Afghanistan, but no infrastructure to send three mediators.

Steen, thanks for your support and encouragement - and your great commitment in House of Futures. I'm pleased that we shall work together again. You have taught me so much of what I can do; had it not been for you, I probably would not be a futurist. With all my heart, thanks for everything we've shared, share and will share.

Thanks to you, Farzin, because you are our intern. For your "NO BS." I like that and you! Looking forward to knowing you even better.

Thank you, Soren Ulrik, for sharing your

path with me - and thus paying attention to why new, crucial decisions in one's working life are both easy and difficult. Thank you for your courage in stepping off the ever-rotating career wheel in the corporate world and for your desire to influence future managers. Looking forward to can-do days, weeks and years with you.

Søren Steen Olsen, or "STO," as I have known you for 13 years. One of your last projects at the Copenhagen Institute for Futures Studies (where almost all Danish futurists have worked) was the UFO Report: Indefinable Flowing Tasks. It was in 2003, I think. I wonder if are they are more definable, today? I wonder what you think about it now?

Flemming, you party animal! Also in business. You write your heart out. You keep quiet. You are curious. Willing to go the distance – the whole distance. With you at Nxt, I found much of what I was looking for seven or eight years ago, and much I did not know existed. We made the coolest magazine together, and won international and Danish awards. At one point, you said it would not last forever, which I absolutely did not want to hear, because what would come next? You were right. Of course, you were right. Good stuff ends, but makes room for other good stuff and lets new things and feelings come forward. To make room for other good stuff to appear. It's not about how good you are, but all about how good you want to be. You rock! And so do all of you co-founding mothers and fathers of the all-times greatest House of Futures.

Who we are? As if we knew. But we are, will be and become. You just see and wait! Come forward, everybody. Let's unwrap tomorrow today and go do some Hot Spots. Yes we will!

HOUSE OF FUTURES (HOF)

HOF is an independent association founded by visionary companies in October 2009. HOF is working to create and manifest the future now in collaboration between the working members of HOF and your company or organization. We are dedicated to be a living association, a highly attractive work space and business partner. Our common vision is to be an inspiring example of the company of the future.



HOUSE OF FUTURES